

## REMARKS

The Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 1, 2002 (Paper No. 10). Claims 59 to 65 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter stated therein, and Claims 66 to 71 have been added, of which Claims 66, 68, and 70 are the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

By the Office Action, Claims 59 to 65 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for indefiniteness and have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent 5,245,534 (Waterhouse) or U.S. Patent 5,572,653 (DeTemple) and under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent 6,012,040 (Goodwin) or U.S. Patent 6,107,936 (Zimmerman). It is not clear from the Office Action whether Claims 59 to 65 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), since there is no specific indication of the grounds for rejection of Claims 59 to 65 in the current Office Action. Further, the Office Action does not provide a specific indication of the portions of the cited references that teach each and every element of the claims. Even though these rejections have all been rendered moot in view of the cancellation of Claims 59 to 64, the art rejections will be addressed herein with respect to the newly added Claims 66 to 71.<sup>1</sup>

The present invention relates to setting and calculating the price of a service offered by a service provider (e.g., a photo shop). More particularly, the present invention provides a service center that stores a plurality of items and their prices in a first table,

---

<sup>1/</sup>In an effort to advance prosecution, Applicants request additional specificity with respect to the portions of the cited references that are considered to disclose each of the elements of a rejected claim, should the claims continue to be rejected.

stores the service provider for providing a service and a template for showing the one or more items included in the service provided by the service provider in a second table. The service center acquires the prices stored in the first table by referring to the template stored in the second table in accordance with a received service request, and calculates the charge of the service based on the prices acquired from the first table.

According to the language of Claim 1, a method for providing a plurality of services over a network is recited, wherein each of the plurality of services comprises one or more items, the method comprising the steps of a service center receiving a service request from a user terminal and transmitting the service request from the user terminal to a service provider. The service center stores items and their prices in a first table, stores the service provider for providing a service and a template for showing the one or more items included in the service provided by the service provider in a second table, acquires the prices stored in the first table by referring to the template stored in the second table in accordance with the service request from the user terminal, and calculates the charge of the service on the basis of the acquired prices.

The cited art is not seen to teach or suggest at least the features of providing a plurality of services over a network wherein items and their prices are stored in a first table and a template for a service offered by a service provider are stored in a second table, and in response to a request for a service from a user terminal, acquiring the prices from the first table for the items indicated by the template stored in the second table corresponding to the requested service, and calculates the charge for the requested service based on the prices retrieved from the first for the items indicated in the second table.

Waterhouse discloses a method for confirming whether price tags are correctly located on displayed items by a host. As such, Waterhouse is not seen to disclose at least the above-identified features of Claim 1.

DeTemple is not seen to remedy the deficiencies of Waterhouse. Rather, DeTemple is seen to describe detecting prices of items displayed in a shop using an IR receiver and showing the prices on a display. This is quite different from a method of providing a plurality of services over a network wherein a first table stores items and their prices and a second table stores a template for a service offered by a service provider that shows the one or more items included in the service, and acquiring the prices from the first table for the items indicated by the template stored in the second table corresponding to the requested service in response to a request for a service from a user terminal, and calculating the charge for the requested service based on the prices retrieved from the first for the items indicated in the second table.

Goodwin is seen to disclose a process for changing prices of items to be displayed on an electric price table. Zimmerman is seen to disclose installing a noise maker on an electric price label in order to make a noise during special promotions.

Accordingly, neither Goodwin nor Zimmerman is seen to teach or suggest at least the features of providing a plurality of services over a network wherein items and their prices are stored in a first table and a template for a service offered by a service provider that shows the one or more items included in the service is stored in a second table, and in response to a request for a service from a user terminal, acquiring the prices from the first table for the items indicated by the template stored in the second table

corresponding to the requested service, and calculates the charge for the requested service based on the prices retrieved from the first for the items indicated in the second table.

Finally, the description of related art provided in the subject application is not seen to teach or suggest the above features of Claim 66.

In view of the deficiencies of the references, the combination of references fails to disclose or to suggest at least the features of providing a plurality of services over a network wherein items and their prices are stored in a first table and a template for a service offered by a service provider that shows the one or more items included in the service is stored in a second table, and in response to a request for a service from a user terminal, acquiring the prices from the first table for the items indicated by the template stored in the second table corresponding to the requested service, and calculates the charge for the requested service based on the prices retrieved from the first for the items indicated in the second table.

In view of the above, Claim 66 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Further, Claims 68 and 70 are believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

The remaining claims each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,  
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to  
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 39,000

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 43775 v 1